



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,381	02/28/2002	Hirohito Terada	JP920010026US1	6715

25299 7590 07/09/2003

IBM CORPORATION
PO BOX 12195
DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

KIM, AHSHIK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

10/085,381

Applicant(s)

TERADA ET AL.

Examiner

Ahshik Kim

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/28/02 (initial filing of application) .
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

- 5 1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 10/085,381, filed on February 28, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 10 The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing
15 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 9, the phrase "barcode is provided on a staff's business card of the visitor" is vague and difficult to understand. The Examiner wonders if the barcode is provided on the visitor's business card or a staff's business card, or if warrant other interpretation.

- 20 Appropriate clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

- 25 A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2876

(e) the invention was described in-

5 (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

10 (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 1-5, 13-18, and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Daily et al. (US 6,353,352).

15 Re claims 1, 22, and 25-27, Daily teaches a scheduling of an appointment (or virtual meeting) over communication network environment (see abstract; col. 3, lines 8+) comprising a plurality of visitors (or participants) whose data is collected and transmitted via PIM (Personal Information Manager application) (col. 7, lines 63+). Since the participants are connected via network, their identification information and visit information such as IP address and communication data is tracked and stored (col. 8, lines 13+; col. 8, lines 56+), and the server computer recognizes and identifies each visitor's platform.

20 Re claims 2, 4, and 24, appointment can be retrieved and cancelled (col. 13, lines 12+), and as shown in figure 9B, a participant can join the meeting from his/her own machine by clicking "Join Netmeeting" command button (col. 15, lines 54+).

Re claims 3, 5, and 23, when the meeting is scheduled, the participants receive the invitation to join the meeting (col. 13, lines 33+).

25 Re claims 13-18, since only invited (or permitted) participants can visit the scheduled virtual meeting, the participants are given the permission to enter/depart meeting when initially invited for the meeting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

5 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10 This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later
15 invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 6 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daily et al. (US 6,363,352) in view of Cooper (US 6,378,771). Daily's teachings have been discussed
20 above.

Although not explicitly suggesting an identification card scanner, Davis discloses a scanner as one of input devices (col. 6, lines 47+). However, Davis fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest that identification data reading means include first and second identification data reading means.

25 Cooper teaches a system and method for managing business meetings (see abstract; col. 5, lines 24+) wherein each participants posses identification card (col. 2, lines 11+), wherein the

Art Unit: 2876

individuals scan the card when they arrive for or leave the meeting (col. 5, lines 63+). The card contains barcode data other identification data helpful to the meeting (col. 5, lines 59+). Just in case a participant did not bring the card, individual data can be entered using keyboard. The system can be set up such that each attendee information can be electronically stored in advance.

5 In view of Cooper's teaching, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ old and well-known identification card to the teachings of Davis in order to further automate retrieving individual data from the card reader. The card ensures that the individual is actually present during the meeting. The card also ensures that the individual is actually present during the meeting. Moreover, the identification card,
10 containing other information can provide additional data (such as a cost etc.,). Although not specifically suggested, it is well-known that such card also functions as a security badge permitting access to the physical conference room (col. 6, lines 9-23).

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daily et al. (US
15 6,363,352) as modified by Cooper (US 6,378,771) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Jacobson (US 6,488,205). The teachings of Daily et al. as modified by Cooper have been discussed above.

Daily/Cooper fail to specifically teach or fairly suggest that the identification means include a business card and a business card reader.

20 Jacobson teaches an appointment/visit scheduling system (col. 1, lines 13+; See other publications cited on page 2) wherein a user is allowed to use an identification card or business card to perform such tasks (col. 1, lines 40+).

In view of Jacobson's teaching, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate old and well-known information card such as business card to the teachings of Davis/Cooper in order to utilize existing business card to perform additional tasks such as identification card to visit and attend the meetings. Carrying
5 numerous card for each given function has been long considered as an inconvenience, and many tried to resolve this issues by creating "universal card" or "one-card" to handle various functions such as id card, ATM card, security access card, etc. In view of the above, adding additional function to existing business card would have been an obvious extension as taught by Jacobson, well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

10

6. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daily et al. (US 6,363,352) in view of Itsumi et al. (US 5,745,046). The teachings of Daily et al. have been discussed above.

Daily fail to specifically teach or fairly suggest that the identification means include a
15 business card and a business card reader.

Itsumi teaches an a visitor identification and security system (col. 1, lines 20+; col. 15, liens 40+ comprising a card, and identification checking device which checks, determines and write resulting/permitting data into the card (col. 14, lines 39+). As further shown in figure 31, such information is used in locking/unlocking a car door (col. 16, lines 42+)

20 In view of Itsumi's teaching, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further incorporate additional functionality to write desired information onto the card, and use the card to have access to a facility in order to use the existing

Art Unit: 2876

card for additional functionality. Opening a gate to facility based on user identification and verification is well known in the art. Although Cooper reference does not suggest such feature, most corporate facility where sensitive information is handled, such locking/unlocking mechanism is widely used regardless of industries they are in. Moreover, such system provide
5 detailed transactional information as to who visited where, and therefore an obvious improvement. Therefore, it is the Examiner's view that adding such feature disclosed by Itsumi is well within one of ordinary skill in the art.

10

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Flink (US 6,422,463); Cooper (US 6,220,512); Ralston et al. (US 6,389,454); Frommer et al. (US 5,947,369); Bilich et al. (US 5,877,483); Zipf et al. (US 5,604,640) disclose
15 various identification card and visitor pass.

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Ahshik Kim* whose telephone number is (703)305-5203 . The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 6:00AM to 3:00PM Monday thru Friday.

20 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax number directly to the Examiner is (703) 746-4782. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)308-7722, (703)308-7724, or (703)308-7382.

25 Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [ahshik.kim@uspto.gov].

30 *All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.*

Art Unit: 2876


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

5



Ahshik Kim
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2876
June 27, 2003

10



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800